

### Remarks

Claims 1-17 are cancelled herein. Claims 18-34 are added herein.  
Claims 18-34 remain pending in the Application.

### Rejection under 112

In the Office Action, Claims 1-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 9 is rejected for informality. Applicant has cancelled Claim 9.  
Therefore, the rejection with respect to Claim 9 is moot.

Claims 1, 3, 8 and 15-17 are rejected for unclear language. Applicant has cancelled Claims 1, 3, 8, and 15-17. Therefore, the rejection with respect to Claims 1, 3, 8 and 15-17 is moot.

With respect to the Examiners rejection of the term "key chain tag-size" as being unclear (e.g., what is considered the dimension of a key chain tag?), Applicant respectfully points out that the Specification clearly provides approximate dimensions of the key chain tag-size on page 14 beginning at line 13 in the discussion of Figure 2. Thus, Applicant respectfully disagrees that the key chain tag-size is unclear.

### Rejection under 103(a)

#### Claims 1-5, 7-12 and 14-17

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1-5, 7-12 and 14-17 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Weiser et al. (5982520) in view of Utsumi (6243741). Applicant has reviewed the cited reference and respectfully submits that the present invention is not rendered obvious over Weiser et al. in view of Utsumi for the following rationale.

Applicant has cancelled Claims 1-5, 7-12 and 14-17. Therefore, rejection with respect to Claims 1-5, 7-12 and 14-17 are moot.

With respect to new Independent Claims 18, 24 and 30, Applicant respectfully states that Claims 18, 24 and 30 include the features "receive a web address from a first Internet appliance, store the web address on the portable device, and provide the web address to a second Internet appliance."

Applicant respectfully disagrees that Weiser et al. teach or make obvious the present Claimed feature. Applicant understands Weiser et al. to teach a device of intermediate function similar to a PDA. That is, Applicant understands Weiser et al. to teach a device that can run applications, etc. Moreover, Applicant understands the background of Weiser et al. to teach against a device that does not provide a broad range of programmable functions. That is, Applicant understands Weiser et al. to teach that such a limited device comes at a price. Applicant respectfully states that Utsumi does not overcome the shortcomings of Weiser et al.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that neither Weiser et al. nor Weiser et al. in combination with Utsumi make obvious the features of the present claimed invention as recited in Claims 18, 24 and 30, and as such, Claims 18, 24 and 30 are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant also respectfully submits that Weiser et al. in combination with Utsumi does not render obvious the present claimed invention as recited in Claims 19-23 which are dependent on an allowable Independent Claim 18, Claims 25-29 which are dependent on an allowable Independent Claim 24, and Claims 31-34 which are dependent on an allowable independent Claim 30 and that Claims 19-23, 25-29 and 31-34 recite further features of the present claimed invention. Therefore, Applicant respectfully states that Claims 19-23, 25-29 and 31-34 are allowable as pending from allowable base Claims.

Claims 6 and 13

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 6 and 13 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Weiser et al. and Utsumi in view of Wiener et al. (6701317). Applicant has reviewed the cited reference and respectfully submits that the present invention is not rendered obvious over Weiser et al. and Utsumi in view of Wiener et al. for the following rationale.

With respect to Claims 6 and 13, Applicant has cancelled Claims 6 and 13 herein. Therefore, the rejection with respect to Claims 6 and 13 is moot.


Conclusion

In light of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests allowance of Claims 18-34.

The Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,  
Wagner, Murabito & Hao LLP

Date: 8/6/04



John P. Wagner, Jr.  
Reg. No. 35,398

Two North Market Street  
Third Floor  
San Jose, California 95113  
(408) 938-9060